

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 SPENCER NEAMAN, et al.,

Case No. 2:16-cv-00217-JCM-PAL

8 Plaintiffs,

ORDER

9 v.

10 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Defendant.

12 This matter is before the court on the parties' failure to file a joint pretrial order as required
13 by LR 26-1(b)(5). The last Order (ECF No. 39) entered May 4, 2017, granted the parties' request
14 to extend filing the joint pretrial to June 16, 2017. Although there is a fully briefed Motion to
15 Strike (ECF No. 49) on file, there are no dispositive motions pending.


16 On July 26, 2017, the plaintiff filed a "Motion to Alter Traditional Court Practice and
17 Schedule this Case for Trial" (ECF No 47). The court has considered the motion, the Response
18 (ECF No 51), and Reply (ECF No 53), and finds the pending motion to strike is not a basis for
19 further delaying the requirement for filing the joint pretrial order. The court will therefore grant
20 the motion to the extent a deadline for filing the joint pretrial order will be set. Once submitted,
21 the district judge will set the matter for trial consistent with his calendar and as he deems
22 appropriate.

23 **IT IS ORDERED** that:

- 24 1. Counsel for the parties shall file a joint pretrial order which fully complies with the
25 requirements of LR 16-3 and LR 16-4 no later than **October 18, 2017**. The
26 disclosures required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3) and any objections thereto shall be
27 included in the pretrial order.
28

3. Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 47) is **GRANTED** to the limited extent the court has now established a deadline for filing the joint pretrial order, notwithstanding the pending motion to strike. Once the joint pretrial order is filed the district judge will decide when to set the matter for trial

DATED this 25th day of September, 2017.


PEGGY A. LEEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE